



© З. Гадушова, А. Гашкова, Д. Сарсой

DOI: [10.15293/2658-6762.2003.09](https://doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.2003.09)

УДК 378+159+31

Оценка компетенций учителей: тематическое исследование

З. Гадушова, А. Гашкова, Д. Сарсой (Нитра, Словакия)

Проблема и цель. Оценка профессиональной деятельности учителей является одной из обязательных обязанностей завучей школ в Словакии. Однако при выполнении этого обязательства на практике отсутствует системный подход к соответствующей оценке уровня профессиональных компетенций педагогов. Стремясь внести свой вклад в устранение этой проблемы, в Университете Константина философа в Нитре (Словакия) был осуществлен национальный проект «оценка компетенций учителей», в рамках которого была разработана методология и набор инструментов для стратифицированной оценки ключевых профессиональных компетенций учителей.

Методология. В статье представлен кейс-исследование, целью которого было доказать применимость разработанной методологии оценки и ее оценочных инструментов на практике. Кейс-исследование проводилось в младшей средней школе, и объектом тестирования была применимость разработанных оценочных и самооценочных листов для оценки десяти ключевых профессиональных компетенций учителя. В исследовании представлена сумма данных, собранных от одного преподавателя.

Результаты. В рамках проведенного кейс-исследования были проверены все разработанные оценочные инструменты, а собранные данные и результаты кейс-исследования доказывают применимость этих инструментов в школьной практике.

Заключение. Учитывая результаты сравнительного анализа записей исследований, были получены два важных вывода. Один из них касается важности интервью после наблюдения, а второй связан с важностью профессиональной подготовки оценщиков.

Ключевые слова: оценочные листы; инструменты оценки; оценка компетенций учителя; листы самооценки; стратификация; тестирование и верификация.

Исследование выполнено при поддержке Словацкого агентства по исследованиям и разработкам в соответствии с контрактом № APVV-17-0071

Зденка Гадушова – профессор доктор наук, PhD, кафедра английского и американского языков, факультет искусств, Университет Константина философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия.

E-mail: zgadusova@ukf.sk

Алена Гашкова – профессор доктор наук, PhD, кафедра технологии и технологической информации, факультет образования, Университет Константина философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия.

E-mail: ahaskova@ukf.sk

Дэвид Сарсой – кафедра технологии и технологической информации, факультет образования, Университет Константина философа в Нитре, Нитра, Словакия.

E-mail: dszarszoi@gmail.com

**СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ**

1. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Jakubovská V. Stratified Approach to Teachers' Competence Assessment // INTED2018: Proceedings of 12th International Technology, Education and Development Conference. – 2018. – Pp. 2757–2766. ISBN 978-84-697-9480-7, ISSN 2340-1079
2. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Predanocyová Ľ. Teacher's professional competences and their evaluation // *Obrazovanie i Samorazvitje*. – 2019. – Vol. 14 (3). – Pp. 17–24. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.26907/esd14.3.02>
3. Hašková A., Lukáčová D., Noga H. Teacher self-assessment as a part of quality management // *Science for Education Today*. – 2019. – Vol. 9 (2). – Pp. 156–169. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.1902>
4. Hašková A., PISOŇOVÁ M. The competences of school leaders and the impact of school reform on their positions. *Progress in Education*. – 2019. – Vol. 59. – Pp. 103–140. ISSN 1535-4806
5. Kasáčová B. Kariérový systém rozvoja profesionality učiteľov // *Pedagogické Rozhlady*. – 2006. – Vol. 4 (5). – Pp. 24–27. (In Slovak) ISSN 1335-0404
6. Králik R., Ambrozy M. Basic problems of education in the context of building a knowledge society // 6th SWS Internationale Scientific Conference on Social Sciences 2019. Conference Proceedings: Education and Educational Research. – 2019. – Vol. 6 (4). – Pp. 55–60. Sofia, STEF92 Technology Ltd., ISBN 978-619-7408-94, ISSN 2682-9959. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5593/SWS.ISCSS.2019.4>
7. Magová L. et al. Hodnotenie kompetencií učiteľov v Európskom a slovenskom kontexte. Praha, Verbum, 2016. (In Slovak) ISBN 978-80-87800-28-7
8. Stranovská E., Lalinská M., Boboňová I. Perception of the Degree of Importance of Teacher's Professional Competences from the Perspective of Teacher and Head Teacher in the Evaluation Process of Educational Efficiency // *Pedagogika*. – 2017. – Vol. 127 (3). – Pp. 5–20. ISSN 1392-0340. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15823/p.2017.36>
9. Stranovská E., Lalinská M., Boboňová I. Teachers motivation towards assessment of their professional competences // *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*. – 2018. – Vol. 76 (4). – Pp. 561–574. ISSN 1822-7864
10. Stranovská E. et al. Výskum hodnotenia kompetencií učiteľa. – Praha, Verbum, 2018. (In Slovak) ISBN 978-80-87800-43-0
11. Szárszoi D. Aplikácia nástrojov hodnotenia učiteľov. Diplomová práca. – Nitra, PF UKF, 2020. (In Slovak)



Zdenka Gadušová

Prof. PhD.,

Department of English and American Studies, Faculty of Arts,
Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovak Republic.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8954-659X>

E-mail: zgadusova@ukf.sk

Alena Haškova

Prof. PhD.,

Department of Technology and Technology Information, Faculty of Education,
Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovak Republic.

Correspondent Author

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8592-7451>

E-mail: ahaskova@ukf.sk

David Szarszoi

Department of Technology and Technology Information, Faculty of Education,
Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovak Republic.

E-mail: dszarszoi@gmail.com

Teachers' competences evaluation: Case study

Abstract

Introduction. Evaluation of teachers' professional performance is one of the statutory obligations of school head teachers in Slovakia. However, in fulfilling this obligation in practice, there is no systematic approach to relevant assessment of the level of professional competences of teachers. In an effort to contribute to the elimination of this problem, the national project Evaluation of Teacher Competences was carried out at the Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (Slovakia) in which a methodology and a set of tools for stratified assessment of key teachers' professional competences was developed.

Materials and Methods. The paper presents a case study the aim of which was to prove applicability of the designed assessment methodology with its assessment tools in practice. The case study was carried out in a lower secondary school and the object of the testing process was the applicability of the developed Assessment and Self-assessment Sheets for evaluating ten key professional competences of a teacher. The study presents the sum of data collected from one teacher.

Results. In the frame of the carried out case study all the designed evaluation tools were verified and the collected data and results of the case study prove the applicability of the tools in school practice.

Conclusions. Considering the results of the research records comparative analysis two important findings were obtained. One concerns the importance of the post-observation interviews and the second one is related to the importance of the evaluators' professional training.

Keywords

Assessment sheets; Assessment tools; Evaluation of teacher competences; Self-assessment sheets; Stratification; Testing and verification.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract No. APVV-17-0071.

Introduction

The main factor that determines the effectiveness of education is the personality of the teacher. This is also reflected in the EU school policy, which promotes the perception of a teacher as a specialist in education and training, possessing the appropriate competences, for which it is necessary to create conditions for further professional development and career advancement. Great attention is also paid to assessing the professionalism of teachers and their professional competences¹ (Magová, 2016 [7]). The assessment of a teacher's professional competences as one of the crucial indicators of the quality of the educational process influences not only the quality of a teacher's way of thinking, their professional growth but the performance and education of the students in particular. Even though the contemporary research focuses on teacher's competence training and assessment, it does not involve the teacher's perception of their competence assessment. It is important that the teachers perceive their assessment as motivating, as a motivating assessment of the teacher from their superiors influences the teacher's personal and professional growth as well as the successfulness in the education process and self-efficacy (Stranovská, Lalinská, Boboňová, 2018, 2017 [8; 9]).

However, the current situation in the Slovak education system (Králík, Ambrozy, 2019 [6]) shows the absence of a systematic approach to the relevant assessment of the level of teachers' professional competences. Nevertheless, assessment of teachers' professional performance belongs to one of the legal obligations of schools

in Slovakia, or better to say, their head teachers (Hašková, PISOŇOVÁ, 2019 [4]).

The term professional competence of a teacher refers to the demonstrable competences of a teacher necessary for the qualified performance of their teaching activity. It is a set of knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes and value orientations that a teacher must possess in order to be successful in the performance of their profession and to achieve the results expected from them.

Just as there is no perfect (ideal) person, there is no perfect (ideal) teacher. Teachers acquire the fundamentals of their professional competences necessary for the successful execution of the teaching profession during their undergraduate studies. However, their development is then a matter of each teacher's own practical experience. In order for the experience gained to have a real impact on the development of teacher pedagogical mastery, it must be (self)-reflected. The teacher needs to be responded to their activity by the pupils, colleagues and school management. In this respect, they are assisted by assessments, where they should also have the opportunity to express their own opinion and attitude. Teacher evaluation serves as a basis for changing their educational activities; it motivates them to seek ways to improve their professional performance (to achieve better professional performance) and participates in shaping and developing their personality. Teacher's evaluation serves also as the springboard of their further career development, the results of evaluation provide background for remuneration and, last but not

¹ EC. Supporting teacher competence development for better learning outcomes. *Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the Strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training* (ET 2020) New priorities for European cooperation in education and training, 2013.

EACEA. *Assuring Quality in Education: Policies and Approaches to School Evaluation in European Schools*. EACEA, 2015. ISBN 978-92-9201. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2797/959997>

least, the results of teacher evaluation also influence their acceptance and social status.

In order to contribute to the elimination of the aforementioned problem of the absence of a systematic approach to the relevant assessment of the level of teachers' professional competences, the national project *Evaluation of Teacher Competences* (APVV-14-0446, 2015–2019) was carried out at the Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (Slovakia). The members of the project research team were teachers from three faculties of the university (Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Education and Faculty of Natural Sciences) who, in their teaching activities, are involved in primary and secondary teacher training. The main objective of the project was to develop a comprehensive model for teacher evaluation and related to it evaluation tools. The set of the developed evaluation tools is based on a stratified approach (Gadušová, Hašková, Jakubovská, 2018 [1]) and in 2019 it was presented in Kazan at the V International Forum on Teacher Education IFTE 2019 organized by the Kazan Federal University in co-operation with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation and the Russian Academy

of Education (Gadušová, Hašková, Predanociová, 2019 [2]).

The first working versions of the developed sets of tools for evaluating teachers' competences were tested in school practice already in pilot research carried out during the first stages of the project (Stranovská et al., 2018 [10]). In addition to the pilot research, the applicability of the designed tools in school practice has been and still is the object of several research investigations. The results of one of the realized case studies aimed at verifying the applicability of the developed tools in practice are presented in this article.

Methods

Methodology of Research

General Background

A starting point of the project *Evaluation of Teachers Competences* was to identify those competences in the frame of teacher professional profile which can be considered to be the key ones. Overview of the ten competences which were identified as the key ones is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Overview of the competences identified as the key ones for a teacher's professional performance

Teacher's professional competences influencing the success of their educational performance

- C1: Ability to identify learner's developmental and individual characteristics
- C2: Ability to identify psychological and social aspects of learner's learning
- C3: Ability to develop learner's personality and their competences
- C4: Ability to create and maintain positive atmosphere in the classroom
- C5: Ability to plan and implement teacher's own professional development
- C6: Subject related professionalism of teachers
- C7: Ability to plan and manage educational process
- C8: Ability to use variety of teaching aids in educational process
- C9: Ability to select and use relevant teaching methods and organizational forms
- C10: Ability to evaluate learner's learning achievements

The next task was to design and develop evaluation tools applicable to evaluate quality of teachers teaching performance. The stratified approach to teacher's evaluation has been based on two specifics. Firstly, the teacher's competence profile (different competences listed in Table 1) has been split into three dimensions they are connected with: learner, educational process and teacher. The approach is closely related to the integration model of education developed by Kasáčová (2006 [5]), which is currently the most up-to-date since it corresponds with the current needs of Slovak education. The second specific feature of the developed stratified approach to teachers' evaluation has been the design of ten Assessment Sheets for evaluators/lesson observers and relevant to them ten Self-Assessment Sheets for teachers who are being observed and evaluated, and, finally, ten sets of questions proposed for Post-Observation Interview of the evaluator with the evaluated/observed teacher. This approach makes it easier for teachers to focus on primary and secondary aspects and phenomena of the competence which is going to be the object of the evaluation. This means that the developed stratified approach to teacher evaluation brings a new specific feature to evaluation - during one lesson the teacher is not evaluated holistically, different aspects of their educational performance (all kind of competences), but only one of their specific professional competences is observed and assessed (i.e. each of the ten key competences is assessed individually, in different lessons). In this way the evaluated competence can be observed more closely how it is applied and whether it is applied properly in teaching process, and various nuances of its manifestation can be monitored.

The first step in the assessment methodology is the evaluation of a particular competence carried out by an evaluator (either

internal evaluator, for example, head teacher, deputy head teacher, chair of the school subject committee, or external evaluator, for example, inspector, member of an external evaluation body, and others). For the observation purposes of each of the ten competences a relevant Assessment Sheet was developed.

As to the type of the items used in the Assessment Sheets, majority of them are of three kinds:

- open items, in which the evaluator records the observed facts verbally in writing,
- closed items in which the observed facts are recorded by using a given scale,
- tabularised closed items, in which the evaluator notes down in the relevant columns and lines occurrence or frequency/intensity/level of the observed phenomena.

The scales used in the closed items of the Assessment Sheets are four point ones (1 – *yes*, 2 – *rather yes*, 3 – *rather no*, 4 – *no*, or: *yes – mostly – partially – no*) with an included possibility to record: CNJ, i.e. cannot be judged if the phenomenon did not occur in the observed lesson. In the final part of the Assessment Sheet the evaluator states some conclusions of the evaluation and gives recommendations (suggestions for improvement, to eliminate the drawbacks found), or suggestions for further professional development of the evaluated teacher.

The second step of the assessment methodology is the assessed teacher's self-assessment. This is done not immediately after the lesson over, but within 24 hours after the lesson so that the teacher had enough time to reflect on their teaching. For this self-reflection of the teacher relevant Self-Assessment Sheets were developed. Analogically to the developed Assessment Sheets for evaluators, Self-Assessment Sheets for the evaluated teachers were designed for each of the ten key

competences. The Self-Assessment Sheets more or less copied the structure of the Assessment Sheets in order to be mutually comparable.

The final, third step in the process of teacher evaluation is the Post-Observation Interview. It is suggested to carry it out within a few days after the observation, as the evaluator must read their own records about the observed teacher's competence and its implementation in their teaching performance and compare it with the record of the teacher's self-assessment (to find matches and differences, think about possible reasons for that and possibly also about the questions they would like to ask). The main purpose of the Post-Observation Interview is not to offend and criticize, but to encourage the teacher in their endeavour or clarify any doubts and misconducts, clarify different viewpoints and misunderstandings and to achieve a kind of positive conclusion about what happened in the lesson, why it happened, whether anything could have been done differently, and with what impact.

In order to get a better idea about the designed assessment tools, as an example of the developed tools, the Assessment and Self-assessment sheets as well as the Record Sheet for the Post-Observation Interview for the competence C3 - Ability to develop learner's personality and their competences are enclosed as the Appendixes 1–3.

Methodology of the Research and Research Questions

The case study carried out in a lower secondary school (ISCED 2) was one of the several verifications implemented to prove applicability of the developed assessment tools and the designed assessment methodology. Carrying out the case study was based on a mutual agreement of the school management and the

evaluated teacher with the designers of the evaluation methodology and tools.

The aim of the case study was find a teacher willing to be observed ten times and fill in ten Self-Assessment Sheets in order to verify the applicability of the whole set of the developed Assessment and Self-Assessment Sheets for the evaluation of all ten key competences with the same teacher. This means that within the case study the evaluators' records from the Assessment Sheets and the teacher's records from Self-Assessment Sheets were mutually compared and analysed. The Post-Observation Interview was not a part of the case study.

The evaluated teacher was a qualified teacher of the subject technology with a long teaching experience at school. The teacher was evaluated by two evaluators at the same time. One of them was the chair of the subject committee (E1) and the second one was a colleague of the evaluated teacher (E2), also a qualified teacher of the subject technology with a long teaching experience at school.

The research issue was to observe and evaluate the ten professional competences of the identified teacher (using the developed assessment sheets and the newly designed evaluation methodology) from the point of view of a member of the school manager, the member of the school staff (a colleague teaching the same subject) and the evaluated teacher himself. The analysis of the recorded assessment data was the basis for answering the following three research questions:

RQ1: What are the findings of the two evaluators (E1 and E2) as to the use and quality of application of the monitored competence in the teaching performance of the observed teacher?

RQ2: How does the teacher evaluate the quality of the monitored competence use and its manifestations during the lesson?

RQ3: To what extent do the assessments of the evaluators and the observed teacher coincide?

Results

Research Results and their Discussion

Given the limited space, we present in detail the evaluation findings about just one of the ten competences monitored, in particular the first (C1) competence – teacher's ability to identify learner's developmental and individual characteristics, and as to the others, we present only the main findings.

C1 – ability to identify learner's developmental and individual characteristics

In evaluating the teacher's ability to identify learner's developmental and individual characteristics, both the evaluators and the evaluated teacher answered ten questions in the assessment sheets, both verbally and using the scale. The numbers in brackets are the values of the scale used by which the evaluator evaluated the monitored teacher, or which the teacher used to rate himself. In case the various verbal evaluations were given, or in the event that only one of the evaluators has notified certain aspects, the designation E1 or E2 of the author of the rating is given.

1. Was the teacher able to accept individuality, or personality of different pupils? How did he do it?

Evaluators (2, 2): The data in both completed assessment sheets show that the teacher accepted the individual needs of the pupils, especially those with special educational needs. They did this by getting feedback from pupils, making sure they understood the issue (E1). The attention of less active pupils he

attracted by asking them questions. Pupils were also given extra time (E2).

The evaluated (2): The teacher stated that he accepted the individual needs of the pupils. He offers help to them in the form of repetition of instructions or individual explanation of the study material. He chooses appropriate tasks for pupils and allows individual pace for completing them. The teacher has a list of pupils with special educational needs and knows how to work with the included pupils.

2. Did the teacher assign different types of tasks and activities for pupils according to their individual differences, or special educational needs? If so, what types of tasks were these? What needs were addressed?

Evaluators (4, 3): The teacher assigned the same tasks to all pupils, but monitored them during the task solution and helped them to achieve the desired goal. The teacher was aware about the needs of the pupils (E2). The chair of the subject committee (E1) stated that he had expected the teacher to use modified tasks for teaching, with simple assignment or instruction for pupils with special needs, which he did not do.

The evaluated (2): It follows from the self-assessment sheet that the teacher prepares tasks and activities for pupils that meet their individual needs. The observed teacher stated that he tried to explain the subject matter to the pupils by using visual aids. He also respected the pupils' own pace of work.

3. Which didactic principles did he most often use (principle of illustration, systematic principle, principle of consciousness, principle of specificity and suitability, activity principle)?

Evaluators: Both evaluation sheets of the observing evaluators show that the teacher applied didactic principles in the lesson, which

helped pupils to understand the subject matter better. Most often he used the principle of illustration and also the principle of suitability. The study material was suitably chosen for the pupils, as well as the appropriate activities for the pupils. The teacher often asked pupils for feedback in the teaching process in order to learn how well they understood and acquired the subject matter. The least used principles were principle of consciousness and systematic principle, which are essential for establishing a positive attitude to learning and the ability to learn (E1).

The evaluated: It follows from the answers to the third question that the teacher is aware of the didactic principles and applies them in the teaching process. Principles of illustration, suitability and consciousness were the most commonly applied principles. Principle of illustration was applied in the form of using pictures, symbols, photographs, instruments. This option was offered to pupils not only in the phase of explaining the subject matter, but also in the revision phase. In the self-assessment sheet, the teacher stated that he applied the principle of consciousness not only in a specific lesson, but also in everyday communication with pupils.

4. How and at what stage of the lesson, in which tasks and assignments did the teacher use the principles?

Evaluators: According to the evaluators, the teacher tried to apply or applied the didactic principles during the whole lesson, or the teacher more preferred the principle of illustration in the explanation phase of the lesson (E1).

The evaluated: The teacher applied the didactic principles during the whole lesson.

5. Did the teacher apply forms of work with pupils (individual work, group work, pair work, and others) based on the identified individual traits of the pupil?

Evaluators (3, 3): The teacher used the individual form of work and the group work in approximately the same proportion. The groups were created spontaneously; the individual traits of the pupil were not addressed by the teacher (E1).

The evaluated (2): The responses given by the evaluated teacher show that he uses the individual form of work, pair work and group work in approximately the same proportion. The teacher noted that in some pairs the weaker pupils were passive and he left the work to be done by a brighter classmate in the pair.

6. For what purposes did the teacher use different forms of work with pupils?

Evaluators: In order to develop communication skills, and to develop fine motor skills of pupils (E1). To acquire new concepts and practical tasks (E2).

The evaluated: In order to achieve the objectives of the lesson.

7. Which developmental and individual differences of pupils did the teacher take into account during the lesson?

Evaluators: From the point of view of both the evaluators, it was hyperactivity of some pupils, fluctuation of attention, alternation of emotions, social sensitivity. Pupils' reactions – their behavior has changed after their admonition.

The evaluated: In the classroom there are two pupils with learning disabilities – attention fluctuation. The teacher tries to keep pupils' attention, constantly monitors pupils with learning difficulties. Pupil reactions – not specified.

8. Was the teacher able to identify individual educational needs of pupils?

Evaluators (2, 2): The responses of both evaluators indicate that the teacher was able to identify the educational needs of pupils.

The evaluated (1): The teacher is acquainted with the medical documentation of pupils, knows the individual needs of pupils.

9. Which needs of pupils did the teacher most often consider?

Evaluators: The teacher most often took into account specific learning needs when pupils were unable to keep pace.

The evaluated: Most often there was a need to explain the study material several times.

10. How did he do this and how did the pupils react?

Evaluators: The evaluators stated different views: alternation of activities, feedback, and longer time to elaborate tasks, emphasizing instructions, development of pupil memory (E1); checking whether the slower pupils could take notes (E2).

The evaluated: The teacher stated emphasizing and repeating some parts of the explanation, assisting with writing notes.

Overall rating: The teacher is aware about this competence; he tried to apply it in the teaching process. It could be seen that he had an overview of pupils' abilities and individual needs and provided them with the necessary help. The teacher assesses the pupil's learning achievements objectively, applies reasonable demands, and takes into account their efforts, conscientiousness and individual abilities. Overall evaluation of this teacher competence by the evaluators reached level B, which represents the expected performance; although in some areas partial improvements could be made and strengths

strengthened. The evaluated teacher rated himself by A, which means above standard performance.

C2 – Ability to identify psychological and social aspects of learner`s learning

Almost half of the assessed items were scaled differently by the evaluators, but all differences were only one-level different. The evaluated teacher except just in one item (when he ranked himself lower than the evaluators did - this was related to the assessment of how he was able to attract pupils' attention) rated himself always better than the evaluators did. The evaluators were unable to assess whether the teacher was aware about the social relationships in the classroom (E1 – probably yes, E2 – it could not be judged). The teacher clearly declared that he knew the class very well.

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, the evaluated teacher – A.

C3 – Ability to develop learner`s personality and their competences

As in the previous case, almost half of the assessed items were scaled differently by evaluators, but with the exception of one item, there were again only one-level differences. In the exception mentioned, there was a two-level difference, but accompanied by essentially the same verbal evaluation. E1 stated – the teacher evaluated pupils' performance verbally, E2 stated – the teacher rarely appreciated pupils' progress. In all items, the teacher evaluated himself better.

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, some areas could have been strengthened, for example, work with pupils from socially disadvantaged backgrounds; the evaluated teacher – B.

C4 – Ability to create and maintain positive atmosphere in the classroom

The classroom climate during the lesson was positive, friendly, relaxed, although there were some disturbing moments, but with minimal impact on the classroom climate. This suggests that the teacher has experience of working with pupils, he has mastered best practices to keep the class in order in the classroom, and his friendly and cheerful nature has influenced the course of the lesson.

Overall rating: the evaluators – A, the evaluated teacher – A.

C5 – Ability to plan and implement teacher`s own professional development

This competence cannot be assessed on the basis of lesson observation. The evaluators did not have some necessary information about the teacher, so the evaluated teacher informed them about what courses he attended, how he applies his knowledge and skills in his field, what teaching materials and teaching aids he has designed and developed, how he disseminates the knowledge and experience from the CPD trainings he attended to his colleagues in the subject committee, how he applies the innovative trends in his educational work and professional development.

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, the evaluated teacher – B.

C6 – Subject related professionalism of teachers

The evaluators' records differed in the evaluation of the use of feedback and ongoing checking of pupils' understanding and acquisition of the study material (two-level difference in E1 and E2 evaluations) and in evaluating how the teacher assessed the pupils, what methods, forms, criteria he applied to do that (one-level difference). Similarly to the previous competences, the self-assessment sheet of the teacher shows that the

evaluated teacher rated himself better than the evaluators, in this case it was up to six items, but the difference was not bigger than one-level.

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, the evaluated teacher – A.

C7 – Ability to plan and manage educational process

The evaluator E1 tended to score 1 and 2 in most items, while E2 scored more frequently 2 and 3. There were only three matches in their assessments. It was in the items asking about how the teacher took into account the requirements set in the school curriculum when planning the teaching process, how he used teaching methods supporting active learner learning, and how he took into consideration the content and performance requirements for the subject when planning the lesson.

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, the evaluated teacher – B.

C8 – Ability to use variety of teaching aids in educational process

Differences in records of the two evaluators occurred in the statements on the adequacy and relevance of the methods used. The evaluator E1 rated them as “fully relevant” while the evaluators E2 as “mostly relevant”. Similarly, the quality of the instruction on the forms of activities was assessed by the E1 evaluator as “clear” and by the E2 evaluator as “factual”. But there was no contradiction in any item. If there were differences, they were maximally one-level ones.

Overall rating: the evaluators - A (excellent performance, there is no need to formulate suggestions for improvement in any of the areas assessed), the evaluated teacher – B (expected performance, but the teacher still could see areas for his improvement).

C9 – *Ability to select and use relevant teaching methods and organizational forms*

Given the content of the lesson, many of the indicators of this ability (competence) were not part of the professional performance of the teacher, so the evaluators could not comment on many questions. These were, for example, the questions about whether the teacher:

- has an up-to-date knowledge about teaching aids and didactic technology that he may use in teaching his subject (based on their availability at school),
- can design and edit documents, charts and presentations in MS Office,
- is able to analyze available textbooks and their use in the teaching process,
- updates the content of teaching aids with regard to the current developments,
- can develop an e-learning course with active content.

The other questions (those that could have been answered) were answered equally by the evaluators.

Overall rating: the evaluators – A, the evaluated teacher – A.

C10 – *Ability to evaluate learner's learning achievements*

Differences in evaluators' ratings were registered for the following items, or questions:

- Did the teacher provide feedback to learners during the whole lesson? (E1: 2, E2: 3)
- Did the teacher point out the pros and cons of learners' performance when assessing their performance? (E1: the evaluated teacher focused evenly on pros and cons of learners' performance, E2: the evaluated teacher focused more on pros of learners' performance)
- What was the impact of the teacher assessment of pupils' performance on pupils?

(E1: activating, E2: positive - on class climate)

Overall rating: the evaluators – B, the evaluated teacher – B.

Based on the analysis and critical assessment of evaluations recorded by both the evaluators and the evaluated teacher, it was possible to answer the set research questions.

RQ1: What are the findings of the two evaluators (E1 and E2) as to the use and quality of application of the monitored competence in the teaching performance of the observed teacher?

The analysis of the records of the two evaluators (observers) showed that during the observed lessons the evaluated teacher proved high level of his competency in respect to all the key professional competences monitored, what was stated by the evaluators in the overall rating. Occasionally there was a one-level difference between evaluators when evaluating some items on the scale, but this was not a frequent case (see above). In the selection of possible evaluation responses there was almost a full agreement between the evaluators. Another situation occurred when the evaluators were supposed to name the problem in their own words. Here subjective opinions were already presented and the evaluation reflected different perspectives of one and the other evaluator on the performance of the evaluated teacher during the lesson. Moreover, the analysis shows that the evaluation is less demanding if the evaluators have a choice of answers and the comparison of the data recorded by the evaluators with the self-assessment data of the evaluated teacher is easier.

RQ2: How does the teacher evaluate the quality of the monitored competence use and its manifestations during the lesson?

From the perspective of the evaluated teacher, his professional competences are well

developed and their high level of application was proved during the observed lessons. He could find only minor areas where he can see some areas for his further improvement. What is important, however, is the fact that he realizes the need for continuous development and education in order to 'keep up with the times'.

RQ3: To what extent do the assessments of the evaluators and the observed teacher coincide?

Evaluation of almost every competence showed that if the evaluation scale was used, the self-assessment of the teacher was better compared to the evaluators' assessment. The opposite evaluation was recorded only on one

question (the evaluators reported better assessment than the teacher). However, we have to say that it was a very rare case when the self-assessment was ranked higher than one level. This overestimation may, in our opinion, be the result of the teacher having long-term experience and good practices that he can defend. We believe that the teacher must adapt his performance in the lesson to the abilities of pupils whom he knows very well and therefore the view of the evaluators who do not know the pupils so well may be different.

An overall comparison of the evaluators' ratings with the self-evaluation of the evaluated teacher is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Comparison of the recorded evaluations

Competence	Evaluation		
	Evaluator E1	Evaluator E2	Evaluated teacher
C1	B	B	B
C2	B	B	A
C3	B	B	B
C4	A	A	A
C5	B	B	B
C6	B	B	A
C7	B	B	B
C8	A	A	B
C9	A	A	A
C10	B	B	B

The data in the Table 2 show that the overall ratings do not differ much, what is either the result of well-designed assessment tools or the effort of both the evaluators and the evaluated teacher to be as objective as possible or they are the combination of both these facts. Our findings are as follows:

- the evaluators came to the consensus and stated the same overall rating for all the monitored competences,
- in two cases, the evaluated teacher ranked himself higher by one level than the evaluators did (competences C2 and C6),

- the evaluated teacher ranked himself one level lower in the case of the competence C8.

Discussion

In relation to productivity on

Conclusions

In addition to providing answers to research questions, the case study proved the applicability of the developed evaluation tools in practice as well as the reliability of the obtained data and results. However, it also pointed out at two important facts:

- the importance of the post-observation interviews, which create space for discussion and justification of different assessments (or justification of their objectivity and removal of subjective views on the monitored/observed aspects of the lesson);
- the importance of providing training for evaluators;
and last but not least, developing the ability of teachers to self-reflect (Hašková, Lukáčová, Noga, 2019).

REFERENCES

1. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Jakubovská V. Stratified Approach to Teachers' Competence Assessment. *INTED2018: Proceedings of 12th International Technology, Education and Development Conference*, 2018, pp. 2757–2766. ISBN 978-84-697-9480-7, ISSN 2340-1079
2. Gadušová Z., Hašková A., Predanociová L. Teacher's professional competences and their evaluation. *Obrazovanie i Samorazvitje*, 2019, vol. 14 (3), pp. 17–24. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.26907/esd14.3.02>
3. Hašková A., Lukáčová D., Noga H. Teacher self-assessment as a part of quality management. *Science for Education Today*, 2019, vol. 9 (2), pp. 156–169. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.1902>
4. Hašková A., Pisoňová M. The competences of school leaders and the impact of school reform on their positions. *Progress in Education*, 2019, vol. 59, pp. 103–140. ISSN 1535-4806
5. Kasáčová B. Kariérový systém rozvoja profesionality učiteľov. *Pedagogické Rozhlady*, 2006, vol. 4 (5), pp. 24–27. (In Slovak) ISSN 1335-0404
6. Králik R., Ambrozy M. Basic problems of education in the context of building a knowledge society. *6th SWS Internationale Scientific Conference on Social Sciences 2019. Conference Proceedings: Education and Educational Research*, 2019, vol. 6 (4), pp. 55–60. Sofia, STEF92 Technology Ltd., ISBN 978-619-7408-94, ISSN 2682-9959. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5593/SWS.ISCSS.2019.4>
7. Magová L. et al. *Hodnotenie kompetencií učiteľov v Európskom a slovenskom kontexte*. Praha, Verbum, 2016. (In Slovak) ISBN 978-80-87800-28-7
8. Stranovská E., Lalinská M., Boboňová I. Perception of the Degree of Importance of Teacher's Professional Competences from the Perspective of Teacher and Head Teacher in the Evaluation Process of Educational Efficiency. *Pedagogika*, 2017, vol. 127 (3), pp. 5–20. ISSN 1392-0340. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15823/p.2017.36>
9. Stranovská E., Lalinská M., Boboňová I. Teachers motivation towards assessment of their professional competences. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 2018, vol. 76 (4), pp. 561–574. ISSN 1822-7864
10. Stranovská E. et al. *Výskum hodnotenia kompetencií učiteľa*. Praha, Verbum, 2018. (In Slovak) ISBN 978-80-87800-43-0
11. Szárszoi D. *Aplikácia nástrojov hodnotenia učiteľov*. Diplomová práca. Nitra, PF UKF, 2020 (In Slovak)

Submitted: 18 March 2020 Accepted: 10 May 2020 Published: 30 June 2020



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. (CC BY 4.0).